

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated October 20, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 11, 17-18, and 34-37 are independent. Claims 17-18 have been amended, and claims 19-37 have been added, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-37 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-7 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217142 of Bobde et al. (“Bobde”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0131395 of Wang (“Wang”). The summary of the rejection and the detailed rejections of claims 12-16 mention “Koskelainen,” but Applicants respectfully submit that this is an inadvertent error in the Office Action due to failing to update the rejection after substituting Wang for Koskelainen. The Office Action took the position that Bobde, with respect to independent claim 1, for example, discloses all of the elements of the claim except “sending a notification from the first entity to the second entity in response to the register message, wherein the notification includes information associated with said at least one

user.” The Office Action cited Wang to remedy this and similar deficiencies of Bobde. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-10 depend, is directed to a method including maintaining, in a first entity of a communication system, registration information from a plurality of users. The method also includes maintaining, in a second entity of the communication system, information associated with the plurality of users, wherein the second entity information is dependent on the registration information. The method further includes sending a subscribe message for an event from the second entity to the first entity, wherein the event is a change in the registration information of at least one of the plurality of users at the first entity. The method additionally includes receiving at the first entity a register message from at least one user, the message changing the registration information of the at least one user. The method also includes sending a notification from the first entity to the second entity in response to the register message, wherein the notification includes information associated with the at least one user.

Claim 11, upon which claims 12-16 depend, is directed to a communication system including a first entity configured to maintain registration information from a plurality of users. The communication system also includes a second entity configured to maintain information associated with the plurality of users, wherein the second entity information is dependent on the registration information. The second entity is configured

to send a subscribe message for an event to the first entity. The first entity is configured to receive a register message from at least one user, the register message configured to change the registration information of the at least one user. The event is associated with a change in the registration information of at least one of the plurality of users at the first entity. The first entity is configured to send a notification from the first entity to the second entity in response to the register message. The notification includes information associated with the at least one user.

Claim 17 is directed to a network element including storage circuitry configured to maintain registration information from a plurality of users. The network element also includes receiving circuitry configured to receive a subscribe message for an event from a first entity, wherein the event is associated with a change in the registration information of at least one of the plurality of users at the network element. The network element further includes receiving circuitry configured to receive a register message from at least one user, the register message configured to change the registration information of the at least one user. The network element additionally includes transmitting circuitry configured to send a notification to the first entity in response to the register message, wherein the notification includes information associated with the at least one user.

Claim 18 is directed to a network element including storage circuitry configured to maintain information associated with a plurality of users, wherein the information is

dependent on registration information maintained at a first entity. The network element also includes transmitting circuitry configured to send a subscribe message for an event to the first entity, wherein the event is associated with a change in the registration information of at least one of the plurality of users at the first entity. The network element further includes receiving circuitry configured to receive a notification from the first entity, wherein the notification includes information associated with the at least one user.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Bobde and Wang fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

Bobde generally relates to a method and system for supporting the communication of presence information regarding one or more telephony devices. More specifically, Bobde discusses a system for detecting and communicating the presence of one or more computing devices. Bobde also discusses a method and system for aggregating presence information generated by multiple devices associated with a single user. Bobde describes a single server acting as a presence agent and a registration agent.

Claim 1, however, recites both “maintaining, in a first entity of a communication system, registration information from a plurality of users” and “maintaining, in a second entity of the communication system, information associated with said plurality of users,

wherein said second entity information is dependent on the registration information.”

Because Bobde uses a single server for both a presence agent and a registration agent, Bobde cannot disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1.

The Office Action took the position that these features are disclosed by Bobde. The Office Action states that the first entity is the “registrar or registration program (154)” and the second entity is the “presence agent.” However, as can be clearly seen from Figures 3-5, the registration program (R) 154 and the presence agent (PA) 152, are part of the same server (102, 201, and 301 respectively in Figures 3-5), and thus are in the same network entity, not in a first and a second network entities. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Bobde fails to disclose or suggest what is recited in claim 1. Claim 11 even more explicitly recites “a first network entity ... and a second network entity.” Thus, Bobde – even more clearly – also fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 11. Claims 17 and 18 each have their own scope, but each recite similar features, and, thus, are distinguishable over Bobde for similar reasons.

Wang fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Bobde. Wang generally relates to a session initiation protocol (SIP) user agent in a serving GPRS support node (SGSN). More specifically, Wang discloses that a SIP application service can be connected to an SGSN by a SIP user agent. Wang discusses, in Figure 12 for example, that a mobile station can register itself to a first presence server (216), which, in turn,

forwards any changes in registration to the home presence server (1206). The two presence servers, however, are operated in such a way that the presence server that is visited only passes information directly to the home presence server that then fields any request from a watching agent.

The Office Action cited Wang for other features than those discussed above, thus, it is unsurprising that Wang fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Bobde with respect to claims 1, 11, 17, and 18. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Bobde and Wang fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of claims 1, 11, 17, or 18, and withdrawal of the rejection of those claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-7 and 12-16 depend respectively from, and further limit, claims 1 and 10. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that each of claims 3-7 and 12-16 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Bobde and Wang. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-7 and 12-16 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, certain embodiments of the present invention address an unidentified problem in Bobde. Because Bobde has a single network entity, both presence and registration servers run within a single server, and therefore share a proprietary location resource, which was viewed as necessary because they are run as a shared process. This

sharing creates a significant increase in the loading of the shared resource especially as the presence functionality has become more important. Thus, implementations of Bobde may require significant investment in a resource capable of handling the large number of requests for presence information.

Certain embodiments of the present invention, however, advantageously overcome this problem, thereby providing a critical and unobvious advantage over the cited art. They accomplish this advantage, for example, by separating the two functions into a first and second network entity. Thus, they can enable the operation of a presence server without the cost of a highly complex server that has to be capable of handling a large number of requests for presence information.

This difference can be seen in the presently pending claims, such as, for example, claim 11, which recites, in part, “a first entity . . . and a second entity.” For this additional reason, the presently pending claims are non-obvious over the cited art of record, and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Bobde in view of Wang and further in view of “IMPS” of Donovan (“Donovan”). The Office Action took the position that the combination of Bobde and Wang discloses all of the features of the claims except “wherein a third entity

sends a subscribe message to the second entity for information associated with said at least one user. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 8-9 depend from and further limit claim 1. At least some of the deficiencies of Bobde and Wang with respect to claim 1 are discussed above. Donovan does not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Bobde and Wang, and, thus, the combination of Bobde, Wang, and Donovan fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

Donovan generally relates to Instant Messaging and Presence using SIP (IMPS), and was not cited with regard to the above-discussed features with respect to which the combination of Bobde and Wang is deficient. Accordingly, it is unsurprising that Donovan fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Bobde and Wang. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Bobde, Wang, and Donovan fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 8-9, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Bobde in view of Wang. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 10 depends from claim 8, and the Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Bobde and Wang fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 8.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided by the Office Action with regard to claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Bobde and Wang fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 10, which depend from and further limits claim 8. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

For the reasons explained above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-37 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that all of claims 1-37 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Peter Flanagan  
Registration No. 58,178

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

PCF:kzw

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal